DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 337 995 EC 300 737

AUTHOR Kjerland, Linda; Mendenhall, Jean
TITLE Comparison of Integration Practices for Children Birth to Three and Three to Six: Results of a Statewide Survey of Minnesota's Local School District Programs.
INSTITUTION Dakota, Inc., Eagan, MN.
SPONS AGENCY Special Education Programs (ED/OSERS), Washington, DC. Handicapped Children's Early Education Program.
PUB DATE 6 Feb 91
NOTE 23p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Administrator Attitudes; *Disabilities; *Early Intervention; Home Visits; *Mainstreaming; Preschool Education; Program Implementation; Social Integration; *Special Education; State Surveys
IDENTIFIERS *Minnesota

ABSTRACT

Early childhood special education (ECSE) program leaders in Minnesota were surveyed to contrast perceptions of programs for children age birth to 3 with those for children 3 to 6. Of the 8,550 children served in such programs, survey responses reflected 64 percent. Survey results are presented for: (1) settings--home, community, and ECSE classrooms; (2) supports and methodology; (3) impact of type of special needs on integration efforts; (4) factors influencing integration efforts; and (5) responder comments. Among conclusions are the following: reported ECSE support for children participating in informal situations in parks, playgrounds, and with neighborhood playmates was rare; many leaders question the relevance of inclusion of children under 3 years yet support it for preschoolers; home visits occur frequently for infants and toddlers but decrease dramatically for preschoolers; plans to expand integration efforts were reported by 60 percent of birth to 3 responders and 72 percent of those representing programs for ages 3-6. The survey is attached. (DB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

Tailor Made Early Intervention
Training and Consultation Services

Project Dakota Outreach

ED337995

Comparison of Integration Practices for Children Birth to Three and Three to Six: Results of a Statewide Survey of Minnesota's Local School District Programs

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Linda Kjerland and Jean Mendenhall
Project Dakota, Dakota, Inc.
February 6, 1991

Minnesota Report

Introduction

In May, 1990, local early childhood special education (ECSE) program leaders were sent a survey developed by Project Dakota, a training and technical assistance service funded by the U.S. Department of Education. The purpose of the survey was to explore the nature of ECSE program practices and influencing factors for integration of infants and toddlers in comparison with those for preschoolers. Children eligible for ECSE services in Minnesota have a diagnosed condition hindering their development or have substantial developmental delay.

The survey was constructed to contrast birth to three with the three to six age group for the following reasons:

1. Minnesota began mandated preschool services more than fifteen years ago. In contrast, infant and toddler services were not mandated until July, 1988.

2. The authors hypothesized that differing perceptions exist regarding the importance and relevance of integration for infants and toddlers versus preschoolers.

Response to the Survey

The Minnesota State Department of Education has determined that 8,550 children are served by districts across the state. Sixty-four percent or 5,574 of those children are represented in this survey. Response by region is portrayed on page 4.

Number of Programs and Children by Age Group

	0 - 3	3 - 6
# of programs responding	59	70
% of programs responding	63%	68%
# of children represented	1,650	3,924

EC300737

A Division of Dakota Incorporated
680 O'Neill Drive • Eagan, MN. 55121 • (612) 455-2335 • FAX (612) 455-8972

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Size of Programs Responding

# of children	0 - 3	3 - 6
under 20	33	18
20-49	20	24
50-100	6	20
over 100	2	9

SURVEY RESULTS

Results of the survey are organized into six areas: the settings used by each age group, program supports and staff methods, effects of type of special needs, and factors reported as hindering or helping local efforts, analysis of comments, and conclusions.

I. SETTINGS: HOME, COMMUNITY, ECSE CLASSROOMS

The most striking disparity between the two age groups was in utilization of home visits. The child's home was clearly seen as a primary environment for infants and toddlers, (81% of programs checked 'weekly' among their top two frequencies of home visits), yet only 10% percent of programs for preschoolers cited weekly visits.

Frequency of Home Visits by Programs *

	0 - 3 programs	3 - 6 programs
none	2%	18%
once per year	2%	32%
2-4 times/year	2%	51%
monthly	9%	41%
every 2 weeks	45%	15%
weekly	81%	10%
more than weekly	45%	1%

* Programs indicated the two most common frequencies.

Utilization of informal and formal community settings, Early Childhood Family Education (ECFE) and ECSE locations were also compared. Programs were not required to provide an unduplicated count; children could be reported in one or more than one category or in no categories. Therefore, percentages do not total 100%. Instead percentages represent the proportion of enrolled children whose ECSE services included but were not necessarily limited to that setting.

ECSE support for inclusion in informal, everyday settings such as parks, playgrounds, and with neighborhood playmates was compared. Considering the reported social isolation of young children with significant special needs and the ready availability of these everyday settings, it appears that informal settings are an untapped intervention resource.

ECSE Utilization of Informal Settings for Children

	0 - 3 children	3 - 6 children
percent receiving ECSE support in informal settings for part or all of their ECSE services	3%	1%

More than one-fourth of children in both age groups (29% of birth to three and 28% for three to six) were receiving ECSE staff support (direct assistance and/or consultation) in integrated community settings such as ECFE, child care centers, and family day care homes.

ECSE parent-child groups were utilized by fourteen percent of 0-3 families and eleven percent of preschool families, slightly higher than ECFE parent-child group participation.

For the present, segregated ECSE classrooms are by far the most common (65%) of the settings utilized for preschoolers. Reverse mainstreaming within ECSE classrooms was used by nearly one quarter of 3-6 year old programs.

Group Settings Utilized for Birth to Three

	% children	% programs
ECSE segregated child group	16%	53%
ECSE reverse mainstream group	2%	9%
ECSE parent-child group	14%	31%
ECFE parent-child group	13%	71%
Integrated community child care, family daycare, other EC settings	16%	71%

Group Settings Utilized for Three to Six

	% children	% programs
ECSE segregated child group	65%	82%
ECSE reverse mainstream group	10%	24%
ECSE parent-child group	11%	23%
ECFE parent-child group	9%	60%
Integrated community child care, family daycare, other EC settings	19%	70%

Regional Analysis of Group Settings Utilized: Percent of Children Birth to Three *

	Reg. 1 & 2	Reg. 3	Reg. 4	Reg. 5	Reg. 6	Reg. 7	Reg. 8	Reg. 9	Reg. 10	Reg. 11
ECSE segregated child group	12%	8%	52%	28%	55%	20%	21%	17%	13%	25%
ECSE reverse mainstream group	1%	0%	0%	0%	0%	3%	10%	13%	7%	0%
ECSE parent-child group	17%	1%	46%	0%	60%	7%	6%	13%	0%	0%
ECFE parent-child group	10%	30%	8%	12%	0%	19%	35%	1%	12%	45%
Integrated community child care, etc.	14%	28%	48%	19%	25%	09%	17%	22%	9%	13%
Informal play settings	2%	11%	0%	6%	0%	6%	6%	1%	1%	4%
# of programs responding by Region	4	5	2	5	1	7	4	6	8	21
# of children in responding programs	47	53	84	68	20	179	65	92	175	871

Regional Analysis of Group Settings Utilized: Percent of Children Three to Six *

	Reg. 1 & 2	Reg. 3	Reg. 4	Reg. 5	Reg. 6	Reg. 7	Reg. 8	Reg. 9	Reg. 10	Reg. 11
ECSE segregated child group	99%	46%	16%	86%	100%	87%	64%	31%	48%	70%
ECSE reverse mainstream group	0%	0%	30%	0%	0%	18%	5%	0%	10%	12%
ECSE parent-child group	34%	14%	0%	6%	50%	9%	0%	3%	0%	13%
ECFE parent-child group	4%	10%	8%	38%	20%	16%	3%	2%	4%	6%
Integrated community child care, etc.	26%	26%	36%	16%	13%	22%	0%	21%	25%	16%
Informal play settings	0%	4%	9%	0%	0%	3%	1%	1%	0%	1%
# of programs responding by Region	4	4	2	4	1	6	3	6	7	30
# of children in responding programs	119	273	64	167	30	445	51	319	366	2104

* Programs were not required to provide an unduplicated count; children could be reported in one or more than one category or in no categories. Therefore, percentages do not total 100%. Instead, percentages represent the proportion of enrolled children whose ECSE services included but were not necessarily limited to that setting.

Given a premise that diversity and flexibility in options is indicative of program quality, analysis of the number of options utilized by programs may be useful for program evaluation. The child group options in the table below include formal and informal groups, ECSE child groups, ECFE and ECSE parent-child groups, and reverse mainstreaming. Home visit options are not included in this count.

Total Number of Formal and Informal Child Group Options Utilized by Programs

	0 - 3 programs	3 - 6 programs
none	7%	0%
1 to 2 options	48%	35%
3 to 4 options	35%	56%
5 or more options	10%	9%

II. SUPPORTS AND METHODOLOGY

If integration is to be a possibility for all children then support for transportation and tuition are critical. There appears to be a great divide among programs regarding tuition subsidies and transportation to and from integrated community settings.

Tuition/Fees and Transportation

	0 - 3 programs	3 - 6 programs
Transportation to integrated settings	43%	65%
Fees waived for ECFE	57%	44%
Payment of fees in other integrated settings		
for a limited number	10%	14%
whenever team decides	31%	51%

The survey asked which ECSE staff are utilized in integrated settings and what roles they play. Although teachers are most likely to be in integrated settings, more than half of the programs utilized speech clinicians and occupational therapists.

ECSE Personnel in Integrated Settings

	0-3 programs	3-6 programs
ECSE Teacher	93%	88%
Speech Clinician	66%	65%
Occupational Therapist	64%	54%
Physical Therapist	40%	37%
Paraprofessional	34%	54%

Staff Approaches Utilized in Integrated Settings

	0-3 programs	3-6 programs
Help child interact (intervene subtly alongside peers)	72%	71%
Team teach	36%	40%
Consult more than twice monthly	65%	56%
Consult less than twice monthly	52%	53%
One to one therapy	60%	66%

In this aspect, also, programs for both age groups appear to utilize diverse approaches with similar patterns of frequency.

III. IMPACT OF TYPE OF SPECIAL NEEDS ON INTEGRATION EFFORTS

Given the chart below, programs were asked to check the one column that best described the status of their integration efforts for children with each type of special need. Data from four birth to three surveys (6%) and five surveys for three to six (7%) were excluded because more than one category was checked. Other programs left many categories blank. Therefore, categories do not total 100%. It may have been more helpful to have included a fourth option of 'have not enrolled children with this need'.

Emotional, medical, and multiple needs of children were rated more often as areas where more help was needed and where integration had less often been tried. Of these, children with emotional and behavioral needs appear to be the most challenging for programs to integrate.

Birth to Three

	have been successful	are in need of help	have not yet tried
speech/language	69%	2%	12%
sensory (hearing, vision)	41%	10%	24%
emotional behavior	24%	17%	31%
medical health	29%	10%	34%
physical disabilities	34%	12%	24%
multiple disabilities	27%	15%	31%
moderate, overall delay	51%	8%	14%

Three to Six

	have been successful	are in need of help	have not yet tried
speech/language	77%	0%	6%
sensory (hearing, vision)	54%	4%	20%
emotional behavior	38%	24%	21%
medical health	38%	7%	29%
physical disabilities	46%	6%	19%
multiple disabilities	24%	14%	34%
moderate, overall delay	60%	3%	13%

IV. FACTORS INFLUENCING INTEGRATION EFFORTS

Survey participants were asked to check all items that influenced their integration efforts and then indicate which two factors had the greatest influence. It appears that the source of influence is quite diverse, perhaps because multiple influences exist for all programs and the cumulative effect is greater than that from any particular source.

However, the highest frequency of helping factors were those in which frontliners, both staff and parents, were the encouragers. Perhaps this means that while training and administrative initiatives were of some influence, more often the parents and staff themselves needed to become encouragers in order for it to happen.

Factors which hindered integration efforts were also diverse. Reluctance of parents and staff fell to the secondary layer of influence and resource issues such as tuition, available early childhood providers, and transportation were more frequently cited.

A comparison of selected rural regions versus the metropolitan region showed similarity in factors for helping and hindering except for an expected higher proportion of "lack of early childhood providers" cited by rural areas.

Other factors written in by one or more programs in the section on helping were: visiting other programs, an interagency grant, and ECFE and ECSE located in the same site. Factors added in the section on hindrances were: early childhood teacher has too many special needs students in one room, unions (MFT), and coordinator's time.

IV. Factors That Helped Integration Efforts
(programs (/) all that apply, (*) two most critical)

Birth to Three	% √	% *
· encouragement from ECSE staff	59%	14%
· encouragement from ECSE coordinator	55%	9%
· previous success with integrating ECSE children	53%	24%
· requests or encouragement from parents of ECSE children	52%	17%
· integration efforts for older children in your community	47%	21%
· articles, handouts, or videotapes on integration	41%	5%
· encouragement from local EC providers including ECFE	40%	14%
· training sessions or conferences	40%	5%
· fees paid for some or all children	36%	7%
· flexible staff schedules	33%	8%
· encouragement from local special ed. directors	31%	9%
· interpretations of state rules, laws or hearings	31%	5%
· positive reports from ECSE programs in other communities	31%	2%
· transportation available	31%	2%
· help from a consultant who came to your program	22%	7%
· encouragement from regional or state level staff	22%	5%
· encouragement from local principals	12%	2%

Three to Six	% √	% *
· previous success with integrating ECSE children	71%	19%
. encouragement from ECSE staff	69%	19%
· encouragement from ECSE coordinator	65%	10%
· requests or encouragement from parents of ECSE children	56%	19%
· encouragement from local special ed. directors	56%	12%
· transportation available	53%	10%
· articles, handouts, or videotapes on integration	53%	0%
· fees paid for some or all children	50%	7%
· training sessions or conferences	49%	12%
· positive reports from ECSE programs in other communities	44%	4%
· interpretations of state rules, laws or hearings	43%	6%
· encouragement from local EC providers including ECFE	35%	6%
· integration efforts for older children in your community	34%	7%
· encouragement from regional or state level staff	34%	3%
· flexible staff schedules	28%	6%
· help from a consultant who came to your program	26%	7%
· encouragement from local principals	19%	1%

Factors that Hindered Integration Efforts
(programs (√) all that apply, (*) two most critical)

Birth to Three	% √	% *
· tuition issues (who pays?)	52%	29%
· lack of EC providers in your area	50%	29%
· transportation issues	45%	16%
· EC programs in churches or synagogues; separation of church-state issue	43%	17%
· inflexible staff schedules	34%	14%
· reluctance of ECSE parents	24%	9%
· reluctance of local principals	24%	5%
· lack of information or help in how to proceed	22%	9%
· reluctance of local EC providers including ECFE	22%	5%
· reluctance of ECSE staff	21%	7%
. interpretations of state rules, laws, or hearings	21%	3%
· reluctance of local special ed. directors	17%	2%
· negative experiences integrating some ECSE children	10%	3%
· negative experiences integrating older children	7%	0%
· inadequate awareness of who are local EC providers	3%	0%
· reluctance of the ECSE coordinator	0%	0%

Three to Six	% √	% *
· lack of EC providers in your area	49%	31%
· tuition issues (who pays?)	46%	31%
· EC programs in churches or synagogues; separation of church-state issue	43%	28%
· inflexible staff schedules	41%	21%
· transportation issues	41%	9%
· lack of information or help in how to proceed	31%	9%
· reluctance of local principals	24%	7%
· reluctance of ECSE parents	24%	1%
· reluctance of ECSE staff	22%	10%
· reluctance of local EC providers including ECFE	22%	3%
· negative experiences integrating some ECSE children	21%	4%
. interpretations of state rules, laws, or hearings	12%	6%
· reluctance of local special ed. directors	10%	1%
· inadequate awareness of who are local EC providers	10%	1%
· negative experiences integrating older children	9%	4%
· reluctance of the ECSE coordinator	0%	0%

V. ANALYSIS OF COMMENTS

Survey respondents were invited to make comments at the end of the survey. Thirty-one programs (fifty-two percent) did so for the birth to three age group and twenty-two programs (thirty-one percent) for the three to six age group.

Birth to Three Programs

Eight of the 0 - 3 programs commenting in the survey expressed doubts as to the relevance of integration efforts for families and for staff for this age group.

> "I'm not sure that it is developmentally appropriate to have special ed focus on integration at this age. More effort and resources should focus on the family unit."
>
> "I'm not sure how much 'integration' we do at this age - but we avoid 'segregation' and structured early childhood groups. I see us as family based at this age, and supporting typical family-based experiences."
>
> "Our interpretation of the law is that 0-3 children are best served in the home or current day care situation."
>
> "Haven't really considered more integration for the 0-3 age group outside of the home..."

And some found staff time absorbed by other activities - integration was simply lower on the list of priorities.

> "Our family problems are overwhelming. Staff spends a great deal of time sorting thru social service issues - getting parents to various aid sources, making appointments, etc."

For some this meant that it was up to families to pursue integration on their own if they wished.

> "Currently, formal integration in programs is not directed by ECSE staff in this district. Parents are informed of ECFE or community-based programs to pursue at their own discretion..."
>
> "Our 0-3 program is basically a home-based program...We usually do not place them."
>
> "The parents we are working with are providing their children with other appropriate integration opportunities with non-handicapped peers, e.g., sibling care during ECFE sessions with other daughter."

Birth to three programs who cited success credited positive partnerships in their community.

> "Integration is an area we need a great deal of work but what we have tried so far has gone well. We have been very impressed with the acceptance and openness to the concept from our local EC providers."
>
> "Community program personnel receptive and acceptive of children with disabilities, willing to work with all of us."
>
> "We work interagency and other agencies provide financial assistance and transportation."

ECFE, in particular was identified as a major focus of 0 - 3 family and staff time and effort for integration.

> "The vast majority of our integration at this level has been with ECFE."
>
> "We integrate children primarily in ECFE and feel this is quite successful."

Several 0 - 3 programs commented that there are challenges associated with this option.

> "This year we have had a number of parents who have been reluctant to be involved with ECFE. This has not been the case in the past years. Four families who need help with parenting skills refused to be involved with ECFE even though we spent considerable effort trying to get them involved at different times during the year when sessions are held."
>
> "Interesting result of our informal survey of families with a multi-handicapped child - prefer non-integrated setting for parent-child group. They reported it was too difficult for them (parents) to observe significant discrepancy in functioning level. But, acknowledged that contact with 'typical' peers was good for their child. Some families report 'negative' comments/ feelings from other parents in ECFE groups."
>
> "We do have situations though where parents are either unable or don't feel comfortable bringing their children to ECFE. Staff would like to bring some of these children in but have been turned down by our ECFE coordinator."

Other comments focussed on inhibiting issues such as subsidizing the cost of tuition in integrated community settings.

> "It seems that, for this district, the issue of fee payment remains a primary stumbling block."

> "Several of our children do attend the local day care centers, ECFE programs, Head Start, etc. at the parents' expense, and we have on occasion observed our students in these settings, but are cautious about intervening because the school is not financially involved."

> "We have, on numerous occasions, asked about using the local day care centers for integration and have been told by the administration that the school is not willing to pay for this. As teachers, we are uncertain as to the laws."

The challenges of inadequate options or support within their community drew comment from several 0 - 3 programs.

> "We are trying but have difficulties with transportation issues, lack of available program vacancies,..."

> "Head Start is primary program and is homebased in most rural districts where center programs exist. Head Start staff doesn't like to handle "our" ECSE kids with problems."

> "Because we are so new at this effort, the upfront planning involved in integrating one child/family can be overwhelming. This is most likely related to the lack of systems in place to "plug into"."

For some, the response to local challenges was reverse mainstreaming, with both risks and benefits.

> "We have been able to integrate through reverse mainstreaming only because of costs involved. Even though this is not our first choice of integration efforts, it has been a very valuable experience for our 2 yr. olds. The staff has been very supportive of the value of the typical peers in motivating the handicapped children. The parents are very impressed by their observations in the classroom. The parents of the typical peers have been very supportive of what they think their children have gained from this experience."

> "We experimented with some reverse mainstreaming and received a big hand slap from the State Department of Education Monitoring Division when we were monitored. This would be a great option for kids who are too fragile to be in a large group."

Two 0 - 3 programs addressed different aspects of staff control.

> "Feeling that "it's easier to do it myself." 'Control' of program activities is with people outside of ECSE team."
>
> "LRE is much easier with 0-3. Teacher schedules can be more flexible. They are not locked into school building and schedules."

Two programs cited the importance and benefits of continuity versus age driven practices.

> "I feel it is important to stress continuity of services 0-6 yrs...and thus eliminate additional transitions for families."
>
> "Our program for early intervention services follows from birth to age six. It is also very diverse - including nursery school experiences, experiences in ECFE services with typical and handicapped programs, senior citizen involvement, kindergarten transition programs, sp./lang. components and a very flexible menu of services to meet the needs of youngsters and families from total mainstream to a full day of programming."

Three to Six Programs

Unlike comments for birth to three where doubts as to relevance and staff responsibility were cited, comments from the three to six programs reflect an assumption that integration can and should exist.

> "There are no great obstacles!"
>
> "Perhaps we need to look into increasing our involvement in the children's activities outside our program's hours as almost all of our learners are involved with Head Start, ECFE, daycare settings, etc."
>
> "We sure have a long way to go!"
>
> "Our integration with 'speech only' kids is fantastic. The others we will strive to improve."
>
> "We still need to work on complete integration for multi-handicapped."
>
> "We also are anticipating involving children in the local library's story hour."

Also, issues related to families were raised far less frequently. Only three 3 - 6 programs mentioned families' roles in integration, two related to ECFE.

> "We are pretty self contained - most of our 3-5 yr. olds are participating in community pre-schools at their parents' expense."
>
> "Biggest problem - finding integrated settings for 3 year olds - especially if parents work and/or are not interested in ECFE classes."
>
> "Lack of ability of parents to attend ECFE programming. It is available but we can't get parents out.

The predominant inhibitor, cited by eleven 3 - 6 programs, was seen as limited resources.

> "...lack of enough choices so we do not overload an EC teacher with too many special needs students, equipment, or support staff in one classroom."
>
> "Many nursery schools are located in churches."
>
> "(Separation of) church and state has been a big obstacle for us."
>
> "We feel somewhat limited in our options (available sites), particularly for three year-old children for which we have no licensed preschool teacher at the site."
>
> "Tight funding in ECSE staffing in general. Integration costs more because it's less efficient."
>
> "We feel there is not enough consulting time between ECSE staff and staff in integrated settings - mainly due to lack of flexible schedules and staff in integrated settings are not scheduled/paid much time beyond that when students are present."
>
> "Lack of early childhood programs within the public school system has hindered our ability to integrate students with handicaps."

Perhaps a significant obstacle has been time itself. ECSE services to preschoolers were mandated 15 years ago.

> "ECSE programs have traditionally been non-integrated and staff is very reluctant to change. Lack of awareness of benefits is a factor. Also giving up a nice comfortable classroom over which one has complete control."

Three 3 - 6 programs wanted to do more with EC community staff.

"Though our (limited) mainstreaning effort has been extremely successful, we regret the limited consultation with nursery school mainstream staff."

"We are trying to do more training of nursery school personnel."

"We are currently looking at a ECSE teacher working with the preschool teacher weekly."

The issue of reverse mainstreaming came up in this group as well.

"We would like to further investigate the legality of using typical peers in our center-based program."

"Reverse mainstream playgroups with kindergarten students coming into ECSE site for play groups."

Half of the 22 programs for 3 - 6 year olds cited successes. Several shared how they had overcome obstacles.

"We are also going to be team teaching at the kindergarten level with 10 children (5 in each kindergarten) with an ECSE teacher and a kindergarten teacher for the 90-91 school year."

"Our integration efforts with Head Start have been great. In one case the ECSE and Head Start teachers team taught."

"with ECFE 1) we go into classroom for choice time with our ECSE class 2 days a week.
2) Friday mornings we have 4 parents/children enrolled on our day for working with families. Our staff goes into their site and works with our families. We run parent group for our parents."

"We have had one parent request integration this year and we supported her and her son at the Y preschool 2 days a week and with us 3 days a week."

"Two districts will be integrating and team teaching with the ECFE programs next year (3-5)."

"We have spent years planning and developing integrated models within our community - 95% of our children served in-center are in an integrated preschool program. We contract services from several agencies each with unique integrated toddler and preschool programs."

"The cooperative is strongly committed to integration - decentralization of services in the upcoming two years."

VI. CONCLUSIONS

We have much to celebrate and much to reflect upon in these findings. Most impressive to us was the creativity, problem-solving, and team work to build bridges and connect children with and without special needs for fun, learning, and friendship within their neighborhood and community. High numbers of programs reported providing tuition subsidies and transportation for children to attend integrated community programs thus affording access to a variety of family income levels.

Concerns were also raised by the findings. Reported ECSE support for children to be part of informal settings such as parks, playgrounds, neighborhood playmates was rare. We learned that many leaders question the relevance of inclusion in the first three years yet support it for preschoolers. Does a message of 'special and separate' occur in early and formative encounters with staff yet 'special and included' is the direction thereafter? Lastly, home visits are occurring frequently for infants and toddlers but drop off dramatically for preschoolers. We wondered to what degree family preference played a part in that shift in practice and whether the benefits of inclusion in informal community settings could be the outcome of more 'home' visiting.

What does the near future hold? When birth to three programs were asked to indicate their intentions for integration in the coming year 34% planned to continue current efforts and 60% planned to expand integration efforts. For three to six programs 28% planned to continue current efforts and 72% planned to expand their efforts. Virtually no programs intended to reduce their integration efforts.

Policymakers, community groups, families and staff, and trainers will each find implications here for their efforts. The state leadership as well as local policymakers can be encouraged and inspired to continue their efforts to promote understanding of the issues and possibilities for integration. Communities can continue to pursue creative problem-solving to uncover and expand a wider array of options. Individual families and staff should be encouraged to pursue their visions for integration for clearly they have inspired change and opened doors in many communities.

All parties need to examine apparent age-driven assumptions about the role of home visits and integration. The result could be greater continuity and flexibility in the role of the child's home and formal and informal settings throughout the early childhood years. Finally, trainers should continue providing both 'how to' and 'why not' guidance for integration but increase availability of practical strategies for assisting teams serving children with emotional, medical, and multiple needs.

The authors recommend that the survey be conducted again in the near future so that the nature and rate of change over time can be captured. It would also be useful to compare data from another state, particularly one which has a birth mandate with education as lead agency, to discern how differing policies and structures effect integration practices.

Tailor Made Early Intervention
Training and Consultation Services

Project Dakota Outreach

Code: _____

BIRTH TO THREE SERVICES
(identical to three to six survey)

1. Number of 0-3 children currently served by your program/service area: _____

2. How often do (0-3) families receive home visits? Check the two frequencies most often used.

1 ___ none	5 ___ 2 times a month
2 ___ about once per year	6 ___ 4 times a month
3 ___ about 2-4 times a year	7 ___ more than 4 times a month
4 ___ 1 time a month	

3. During May 1990 how many children 0-3 were served in group settings?

1 _____# in ECFE parent-child groups with some ECSE consultation or assistance
2 _____# in integrated community settings (other than ECFE) (such as family day care, child care center, etc.) with some ECSE consultation or assistance
3 _____# in informal play settings (e.g's. with neighbors, community playgrounds etc.) with some ECSE consultation or assistance
4 _____# in ECSE reverse mainstreaming classrooms (non-handicapped peers brought in)
5 _____# in ECSE child groups or classrooms
b. ages _____ c. times per week _____
6 _____# in ECSE parent-child groups
b. ages _____ c. times per week _____
7 _____ other:

4. What do 0-3 ECSE staff do in integrated settings? Check all approaches used this year.

1 _____ team teaching (planning and co-leading the session)
2 _____ consulting less than twice a month
3 _____ consulting more than twice a month
4 _____ one to one therapy or instruction with child
5 _____ helping the child interact and learn alongside peers by observing and subtlely intervening at times.

Survey developed by Project Dakota Outreach, April, 1990.

A Division of Dakota Incorporated
680 O'Neill Drive • Eagan, MN. 55121 • (612) 455-2335 • FAX (612) 455-8972

5. Which of the following 0-3 staff are involved in integrated settings?

1 ____ ECSE teacher
2 ____ ECSE therapist: a.___ S/L b.___OT c.___PT
3 ____ ECSE paraprofessional
4 ____ other:

6. What other ways does your program help children 0-3 attend and participate in integrated settings? Check all that apply.

1 ___ transportation to/from integrated setting(s)
2 ___ ECFE fees waived
3 ___ payment of fees to attend an integrated setting; if yes, please check one:
   a. ___ available only to certain groups within ECSE such as children with speech delays
   b. ___ available to a limited number but can have any type of ECSE need
   c. ___ available to any ECSE child whenever team decides
4 ___ other:

7. Has the type of special needs influenced your 0-3 integration efforts? Check (✓) the category that best describes your efforts.

	a. we have been successful	b. we are in need of help	c. we have not yet tried	
1	_____	_____	_____	speech/language
2	_____	_____	_____	sensory (hearing, vision)
3	_____	_____	_____	emotional/behavioral
4	_____	_____	_____	medical/health
5	_____	_____	_____	physical disabilities
6	_____	_____	_____	multiple disabilities
7	_____	_____	_____	moderate, overall delays
8	_____	_____	_____	general delay

8. We would like to prepare and distribute a list of programs who feel proud of their integration efforts and wish to invite others to visit. Do you want to be on the list? Yes____ No____
Contact person:_____Telephone:_____

9. What are your plans re: integration for 0-3 next year?
1 ___ we will continue current efforts
2 ___ we will expand our efforts
3 ___ we will be doing less than this year

10. What has **HELPED** your 0-3 program's efforts toward integration?
· Check (✓) all that apply · Star (*) the two that helped the most

	(✓)	(*)	
1	___	___	previous success with integrating ECSE children
2	___	___	integration efforts for older children in your community
3	___	___	positive reports from ECSE programs in other communities
4	___	___	articles, handouts, or videotapes on integration
5	___	___	training sessions or conferences
6	___	___	help from a consultant who came to your program
7	___	___	requests or encouragement from parents of ECSE children
8	___	___	encouragement from local principals
9	___	___	encouragement from local spec. ed. directors
10	___	___	encouragement from the ECSE coordinator
11	___	___	encouragement from ECSE staff
12	___	___	encouragement from regional or state level staff
13	___	___	encouragement from local EC providers including ECFE
14	___	___	interpretations of state rules, laws or hearings
15	___	___	transportation available
16	___	___	fees paid for some or all children
17	___	___	flexible staff schedules
18	___	___	other:

11. What has **HINDERED** your 0-3 program's efforts toward integration?
· Check (✓) all that apply · Star (*) the two greatest obstacles

	(✓)	(*)	
1	___	___	negative experiences integrating some ECSE children
2	___	___	negative experiences integrating older children
3	___	___	lack of information or help in how to proceed
4	___	___	reluctance of ECSE parents
5	___	___	reluctance of ECSE staff
6	___	___	reluctance of the ECSE coordinator
7	___	___	reluctance of local principals
8	___	___	reluctance of local special ed. directors
9	___	___	reluctance of local EC providers including ECFE
10	___	___	interpretations of state rules, laws, or hearings
11	___	___	transportation issues
12	___	___	tuition issues (who pays?)
13	___	___	inflexible staff schedules
14	___	___	EC programs in churches or synagogues; separation of church-state issue
15	___	___	lack of EC providers in your area
16	___	___	inadequate awareness of who are local EC providers
17	___	___	other:

12. Your comments:

Tailor Made Early Intervention

Training and Consultation Services

Project Dakota Outreach

INVITATION TO VISIT

The following school districts indicated on their 1990 survey that others may visit their integration efforts. A contact person is provided for each.

Region	Name/Address/Phone [age range to visit]
11	Mona Kahl [0-3, 3-6] EC Special Ed-District 283 6300 Walker Street St. Louis Park, MN 55416 (612) 925-6238
1,2	Terri Hamilton, ECSE Coor. [0-3] Keith Erickson, Director Red Lake Falls ASEC - Box 445 Red Lake Falls, MN 56750
7	Jill A. Haak [0-3] 570 First Street S.E. St. Cloud, MN 56301 (612) 252-8427
11	Maggie Lesher [0-3] 0-3 Program WSP 1037 Bidwell West St. Paul, MN 55118 (612) 451-0102
3	Susan Froehlich [0-3] (218)727-8125 Diane Elleson [3-6] (218) 722-3775 Duluth Public Schools 2nd Street and Lake Avenue Duluth, MN 55802
11	Sandy Coder, ECFE teacher [0-3] New Prague Middle School 405-1st Avenue N.W. New Prague, MN 56071
6,8	Betty Abrahamson [0-3] P.O. Box 69 Pipestone, MN 56164 (507) 283-8653

Region	Name/Address/Phone [age range to visit]
11	Elaine Schwimmer [0-3, 3-6] Robbinsdale Area Schools - Dist. 281 4148 Winnetka Avenue North New Hope, MN 55427 (612) 533-2781
7	Martha Westman [0-3, 3-6] North Branch Middle School North Branch, MN 55056 (612) 674-7001 x 231 or Metro 464-8080 x 231
11	Donna Wright [0-3, 3-6] Hopkins Early Childhood Spec. Ed. 1001 State Highway 7 Hopkins, MN 55343 (612) 933-9343
11	Linda Reese,Interim Sch.[0-3, 3-6] District #287 1820 Xenium Lane North Minneapolis, MN 55441 (612) 553-5685
11	Gay Pirri [0-3] Edina Schools 5555 West 70th Street Edina, MN 55435 (612) 927-9721
8	Wayne Peterson [0-3] 1012 N. 5th Avenue-Box 265 Windom, MN 56101 (507) 831-4600
7	Trish Oeltjenbruns-Lindblad [0-3,3-6] Cambridge Senior High 430 N.W. 8th Street Cambridge, MN 55008 (612) 689-3632

Region	Name/Address/Phone [age range to visit]
10	Gail Midthune (507) 454-8604 Dr. Michaels, Ed. Ad. Pat Norman (507) 452-5812 654 Huff Street Winona, MN 55987
11	Debra Frogner Bloomington Schools - ISD 271 8900 Portland Avenue South Bloomington, MN 55420 (612) 887-9184
11	Karen Imhoff [3-6] Ind. School District 199 9875 Inver Grove Trail East Inter Grove Heights, MN 55075 (612) 457-7286
11	Henry Panowitsch [3-6] Moundsview School District 2959 Hamline Avenue North St. Paul, MN 55113 (612) 636-3650
4	Al Swedberg [3-6] Moorhead Special Education 810-4th Avenue South Moorhead, MN 56560
11	Bob Bradshaw [3-6] Osseo Schools 11200-93rd Avenue North Maple Grove, MN 55369 (612) 425-4131 x 524
9	Ruth Ann Block [3-6] ECSE Teacher Elysian Public Schools 500 E. Pacquin Street Waterville, MN 56096 (507) 267-4313

Region	Name/Address/Phone [age range to visit]
9	Linda Watson [3-6] Franklin Bldg. 1000 North Broad Mankato, MN 56001 (507) 387-1818
11	Carolyn Ousdigian [3-6] Riverview School 271 E. Belvidere Street St. Paul, MN 55107 (612) 293-8665
11	Gail Sutter [3-6] Ind. School Dist. 622 2055 East Larpenteur Avenue North St. Paul, MN 55109 (612) 770-4758
11	Diana Bom [3-6] Early Childhood Special Ed. Southwood School 4901 W. 112th Street Bloomington, MN 55437 (612) 884-9955
1,2	Keith Erickson, Director [3-6] Terri Hamilton, ECSE Coor. Red Lake Falls ASEC-Box 445 Red Lake Falls, MN 56750
11	Tricia Penn, Supr. of DASH, PACES, and Integr. Spec. Tchr. [3-6] School District 917 1300 E. 145th Street Rosemount, MN 55068 (612) 423-8426
11	Debbie Banas [0-3, 3-6] 1785 Greeley Street South Stillwater, MN 55082 (612) 439-5160 x 321

1223K/11-12